THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION No.27226 of 2006

Dated:23.08.2007

Between:

Smt.V.Sumitra Reddy, W/o.V.Rajgopal Reddy.

…Petitioner

and

The Joint Collector,
Ranga Reddy District, Lakdi-ka-pool,
Hyderabad,
and anothers.

…Respondents

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION No.27226 of 2006

ORDER:

This Writ Petition is filed seeking a writ of mandamus directing respondents 1 and 2 to consider the application of the petitioner dated 14.12.2004 submitted to the second respondent for grant of Occupancy Rights Certificate (ORC) in respect of the land in new Survey No.161 admeasuring Acs.11.03 guntas situated at Majeedpur Village of Shameerpet Village in Ranga Reddy District, under the provisions of the Andhra Pradesh (Telangana Area) Abolition of Inams Act, 1955.

The matter is coming up for admission from 02.01.2007. On that day, the learned Counsel for the petitioner sought time. Again when the matter was listed on 01.05.2007, learned Counsel for the petitioner was absent, and there was no representation. Be that as it is, the case of the petitioner is that she purchased the land admeasuring Acs.15.00 in Survey Nos.33/a and 33/aa situated at Majeedpur Village from M/s.S.Ramachandra Rao and Seetarama Rao under registered sale deed dated 20.03.1972, and she was also put in possession. She submitted an application on 28.12.2001 for grant of ORC in respect of the land comprised in Survey Nos.31 and 32. The petitioner alleges that with the connivance of the vendors, the third respondent herein obtained ORC from the second respondent vide order dated 21.01.1990 in file No.L/2053/89. The petitioner, therefore, filed an appeal before the first respondent, being Case No.F1/3754/2005, which was dismissed on 21.07.2005, as barred by limitation. In the meanwhile, the petitioner sent another application on 14.12.2004 for issue

of ORC, in vain. Therefore, the present Writ Petition is filed.

A perusal of the order passed by the first respondent dated 21.07.2005 would show that the petitioner preferred the appeal against the ORC granted in 1970, and the same was dismissed as barred by limitation. When once her claim for ORC is rejected way back in 2005, there would not be any necessity to consider her application again.

The Writ Petition is misconceived, and the same is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

_____

(V.V.S.RAO, J)

23.08.2007
vs